

A critical analysis of Indian Logical Agreement System in Languages in the archaeological perspective

K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, IRS
(Retd.),
Guest Faculty and Research scholar,
Department of Ancient History and
Archaeology,
University of Madras,
Chepauk, Chennai – 600 005.
Cell: 98402 92065
e-mail: kopallerao@yahoo.co.uk

Dr J. Soundararajan, Ph.D.,
Associate Professor and HOD-In-
charge,
Department of Ancient History
and Archaeology, University of
Madras,
Chepauk, Chennai – 600 005.
Cell: 94456 28813
e-mail: jsrajan2013@gmail.com

K. Vivekananda Rao
M.S (Germany),
Sr. Engineer (SVH
Development)
Mahendra and Mahendra
Limited,
Mahendra World City,
Chingleput.

Introduction –Archaeological approach to Linguistics: Indian logic has been as ancient as philosophy dated to c.2500 BCE or even earlier based on the scientific principles of epigenetics, ontogeny and phylogeny¹. The sounds produced by the Palaeolithic men were definitely understood by the fellow-Palaeolithic men and hence converting into a language had been logical conclusion. Had they used written script on any medium that could not have been survived now in the 21st century. The same has been the case of the subsequent evolved men of Mesolithic, Neolithic, Chalcolithic, Megalithic, protohistoric and historic periods. Hominid > homoerectus > homosapien > modern man evolution and development logically proves the progress and development of script, language and literature also during the respective periods. However, coming to logic of any subject, including linguistics, agreement can be reached with consensus. The Indian philosophical debates recorded reasoning, sense and judgment. Thus, Logical agreement has been accepted as a system². Accordingly, the Indian Logical Agreement system is also studied and understood in the context. The computational methodology has been reduced to archaeological interpretation.

Protohistoric Indus Valley Civilization: The Indus-Harappan civilization is considered as protohistoric with the script undeciphered. However, the proto-Aryan and proto-Dravidian languages are discussed. Proto-Indo-Aryan (sometimes Proto-Indic) is the reconstructed proto-language of the Indo-Aryan languages. It is intended to reconstruct the language of the Proto-Indo-Aryans. Being descended from Proto-Indo-Iranian (which in turn is descended from Proto-Indo-European), it has the characteristics of a Satem language. Proto-Dravidian is the linguistic

¹ The history of Indian Logic considers three principal phases of developments:

1. Prehistoric / Vedic period c.3500 – 650 BCE.
2. The ancient school of Indian logic with the representative text, Nyaya Sutra of Gautama (650 BCE. - 100 CE.),
3. the Medieval school of Indian logic with the representative text, PramanaSamuccaya of Dignaga (100 - 1200 CE.) and
4. the modern school with the representative text, Tattva Cintamani of Gangesa (900 CE. onwards).

²Modern Western formal logic has so far failed in describing logical relations within or between sentences as used in ordinary language or in most of philosophical and scientific discourse. The Indian tradition has handled this problem with much greater sophistication. A comprehension of the basic methodologies of the śāstras of Kanāda and Pānini will help in carrying forward this tradition.

reconstruction of the common ancestor of the Dravidian languages. It is thought to have differentiated into Proto-North Dravidian, Proto-Central Dravidian, and Proto-South Dravidian, although the date of diversification is still debated.

Why Indus-Harappan and Vedic people were illiterate?: Whether Indus Valley Civilization proceeded or preceded Vedic Civilization had been the continuous and continued debate and with the Aryan-Dravidian dichotomy, and it has become complicated with complexities. The Vedic Sanskrit speaking people were not having a script and thus they were illiterate (prehistoric). The Indus-Harappan people were also illiterate³ in spite of having an advanced civilization with advancements of science and technology. From the Russians to Rajesh Rao⁴, the IVC symbols, pictograms and signs have been subjected to computer analysis, but, no consensus has reached for decipherment. There have been many attempts of decipherment, but, none could read all the symbols found on all the seals in any particular language conclusive. Thus, the proposal of Iravatham Mahadevan⁵ “Neti, neti” = neither this or that, continues, as all the symbols, signs or pictograms could not be classified, codified and deciphered into acceptable alphabets so that they could be read by all. Of course, the “Aryan-Dravidian” question also continues with the issue.

Aryans versus Dravidians and Sanskrit versus Tamil: Unlike the European or American or West Asian thinking of evolution of man from monkey affecting the historiographical processes of every subject, because of theological implications, in South Asian, India in particular, there has not been any restriction, as the nomadic Aryans were composing the ancient literature (c.3500-1500 BCE), that too, in a dead language. According to the popular “Dravidian” hypothesis, highly civilized “Dravidians” were living there at the IVC and they were driven away by the nomadic Aryans. So the Dravidians could produce Sangam literature after moving down to Tamizhagam (c.300 BCE to 100 CE) after travelling a long distance, now the antiquity extended to c.580 BCE⁶. Incidentally, though the “Dravidians” knew “Ariyans”⁷ but, could not mention themselves as “Dravidians” in their own Sangam literature.⁸ Of course both were singing and composing songs without any script but moving from one place to another. However, why the Sangam period has been dated

³ Steve Farmer, *Illiterate Harappans – Theoretical Implications of recent Studies of India’s first civilization (The so-called Integration Era, c.2600-1900 BCE)*, <https://safarmer.com/washstate.pdf>

⁴ Rao, Rajesh PN, et al. “On statistical measures and ancient writing systems.” *Language* 91.4 (2015): e198-e205.

⁵ Mahadevan, Iravatham. “*Presidential Address: What Do We Know About the Indus Script? Neti neti (Not this nor that)*.” *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*. Vol. 49. Indian History Congress, 1988.

⁶ Based on the C-14 dating given by the Beta Analytical Laboratory, USA and declared by the Government of Tamilnadu. The date is assigned a few signs found on the potsherds that were reportedly found in the same layer, where the dated sample was also recovered and dated to c.580 BCE.

⁷ K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, ‘*Ariyar*’ in the Ancient Tamil Literature, *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, Calcutta, 1990, p.165.

....., “Seminar on the Aryan Problem”, The Mythic Society and The Bharatriya Itihasa Sankalana Samiti, Bangalore, 1991, pp.215-225.

⁸ K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, “*Dravidians – A Literary & Anthropological Study*”, *Proceedings of 52nd session of Indian History Congress*, New Delhi from February 21-23, 1992. Modified version, “*Dravidian Problem*” The proceedings of the BISS, Warangal, India, 1992, pp.38-45.

to c.6th cent.BCE and not to the IVC period from the place where they were driven out. Yet, the Aryans were able to go on singing the poems, everywhere, they went with the same prosody, syntax, grammar, but the Dravidians could do only in the Tamilagam. None has wondered about their memory, the ability of recording such poetry in their brains and transmitting to their progeny. Of course, they were waiting for Asoka (269-232 BCE) to receive script from the Greeks, so that he started inscribing on the stones. It is not known as to how Parsvanatha (872-772 BCE), Mahaveera (599-527 or 425 BCE), Buddha (563-486 BCE), whose religion attracted Asoka to get converted, could have read the Vedas to oppose the vilified Brahmins. In other words, Buddha could have learned Sanskrit without script and oppose its religion, but had chosen to Prakrit to record his teachings. However, now, it is claimed that the “Dravidians” were having pre-Asokan script dated to c.580 BCE and therefore, they were more historic than the Mauryans too.

Mind, body and psychosomatic processes⁹: Modern Man claims many times that he is scientific, rationalist, analytical, systematic, logical, exact and precise in his approach dealing with abstract subjects and therefore, he speaks, acts and advises authoritatively in such proceedings. However, when the question of visible and invisible objects and subjects come, he sticks to his own brand of rationalism, logic, system and turning into agnostic, sceptic and cynical too.

Thus, when one man asks another about mind and body, psychosomatic processes, many such scientific explanations would come into play¹⁰. Thus, the following questions are raised¹¹:

- What is mind?
- Whether it is visible or invisible?
- If it is invisible, why?
- Why it should be invisible, if it has to be associated with visible body?
- If that is the case, what is the necessity of “invisibleness” requiring something objective to get “visibleness / visibility”?
- Where is mind in the human body?
- How it is conceived, perceived, identified, recognized and located?
- whether it lives with one body or more bodies,
- Whether it dies with the body or not?
- If it does not die with the body, where it goes after death?
- Whether it is animate or inanimate?
- Why minds cannot be changed from one body to another?
- Why it cannot be removed temporarily from one body?

⁹ K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, **A Brief outline of the Siddha understanding of the Body and mind: New Research**, A paper presented at the workshop conducted on “Perspectives of different knowledge systems on “The Body and Mind” held at Bangalore on August 24th and 25th 2012.

¹⁰ Similar questions can be raised about spirit, soul, atma, karma etc., at one side and ghost, phantom, apparition etc., at other side dealing with real and ethereal subjects and objects.

K. V. Ramakrishna Rao **Traces of Advaita concept in the Ancient Tamil Literature**, a paper presented at the National Seminar on “Religion and Society in Peninsular India (7th-16th C.E)” held at the Pondicherry University, Pondicherry from 24th to 26th February 2011.

¹¹ These questions have been adopted and developed from the questions raised in the following Tamil book:

Vedaprakash, **Indiya tattuvattin tonmai (The Antiquity of Indian Philosophy)**, in “Contribution of South India to Indian Religion and Philosophy”, Chennai, 2009, pp.1-10.

- If mind / soul / life can be transferred from one body to another, whether with that bodily experience, can really anything be experienced?
- Such experienced experience can again be transferred to original body?
- If so, how the original body could feel the experience of the other body with the transferred mind / soul / life?
- After death of body, if at all, it goes to another body, where it exists during the transition period?
- Or immediately, it goes to another body, where conception starts inside a womb, somewhere on earth?
- If that is so, how such process is decided?

These are important for the study of epigenetics, ontogeny and phylogeny. Thus, many more questions can be asked, but generally, no man could give satisfactory answer, yet, all men accept mind with all skepticism, agnosticism, cynicism, rationalism and of course with atheism. The questions may appear at one stage as unscientific, and that is why once Einstein said, “*Science ends where philosophy starts*”! Of course, philosophical studies have only been changed to psychological during modern period in 19th-20th centuries, thus such studies have been shifted to laboratories from the theological seminaries. In the context, it is shown that the Tamil Sangam Literature exactly deal with the above questions figuratively using the metaphor and euphemism of Lover and Lady-lover. Interestingly, Thirumanthiram deals with the above questions specifically. However, the literature is dated to later period.

Ontogeny, Phylogeny and epigenetics: In the case of evolution of man, body and mind relations, research has been going on to find out the connection of memory, past, thinking or writing of the past and its preservation¹². Thus, the mnemonics (the study and development of systems for improving and assisting the memory) of the Indians has not been noted by the historiographers so far, but, now it can be studied. Here, the study of ontogeny¹³, phylogeny¹⁴ and epigenetics¹⁵ come into play. The biological evolution and processes of development of language, literature and connected people and society, such factors have to be taken into consideration by the historiographers. Mother tongue, thinking language, and working language also play a role in the development of language and language system. The nomadic people and people moved from one place to another had to undergo the changes while travelling thousands of kms distance with a gap of some 3500-2500 YBP. With all the hereditary and environmental factors, when the spoken language was reduced to writing for transmission, the historic records are expected by the archaeologists and historians. Unless the evolution of language, cognition and

¹²Steven Mithen. ***The Singing Neanderthals: The Origins of Music, Language, Mind and Body***, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London 2005.

¹³ Ontogenesis is the development of a language or a language group produced from people with specific individual organism or anatomical or biological feature from the earlier stage to maturity.

¹⁴**Phylum + genesis** = class + origin thus, again, in biology, phylogenesis is the evolutionary development and classification of species or group of organism [The Greek **phule** means race or tribe]. Phylogenesis is the evolutionary development and classification of a language or group of languages spoken by or still being spoken by certain people or group of people.

¹⁵ Epigenetics, in biology, is progressive development of an embryo from an undifferentiated egg-cell. Thus, it is progressive development of a language or group of languages spoken by a group of people or groups of people.

recognition of language and its reduction to writing and the written records are dated chronologically arranged, historical interpretation cannot be given.

How the Indians were interacting with each other between IVC (2250-1950 BCE) and Asoka (c.3rd cent.BCE): The Indus-Harappan-Mohanjadaro Civilization disappeared with the peak period 2250-1950 BCE. Though, “Mahajadapadas” were there, they were issuing “tribal coins” with or without script. John Allan noted that script was used in the tribal coinage and they have been dated to the period c.1000 BCE to first centuries. The continuance of the IVC symbols has also been noted on the tribal coins. Thus, the gap 1950 to c.300 BCE is filled up, if the dating of the tribal coins is taken into account. The traditional date of Mahabharat is taken as 3102 BCE and it was recorded in the Pulikesin inscription¹⁶. The Cera Kings claimed that they provided food to the soldiers who fought in the Kurukshetra battle¹⁷. In other words, the people had been living in India with all facilities, amenities and requirements. Therefore, there is no logic that they were illiterate and the period was prehistoric, till Asoka copied script from the Greeks after the Alexander’s invasion in 326 BCE.

Analysing the possibilities of the origin of the script with the available evidences: Thus, the possibilities have been –

1. **There was no script at all:** There was no script, and yet, the people were so talented and expertise to memorize all the Vedic, Aranyaka, Upanishad, Vedanga and other texts and transmit them to others for 5000, 3000 or 2000 or 1000 years. So also, the Sangam literature is dated to c.6th cent.BCE.
2. **Script was there:** There was script written on the medium that was not available, disappeared or destroyed.
3. **The existing script has been dated wrongly:** Or the existing script-evidences have been dated inconsistent with the literary development of language.

However, the non-decipherment of the IVC script only predominates the issue, in the context of linguistics.

Why a script is required?: initially, mother does not require any script to write and teach her baby, as teaching and learning processes take place by orally or by sound. Then, the child starts scribbling and scrawling on the floors and walls from the states of non-decipherment to decipherment. Yet, mother, father and all members of the family become so happy and thrilled with joy that their child writes a script. Yes, such scribbling and scrawling are directed and oriented to specific forms, standardized shapes and acceptable script. Then, the child understands to write so that it is deciphered by others. And the processes repeat, when the child grows up and becomes mother. So why a script is required?:



To remember something and recollect



Convert sound into shape



Subjective to objective

¹⁶ John Faithful Fleet (1879), Editor: Jas Burgess, *Indian Antiquary*, Volume VIII, A Journal of Oriental Research, pp. 239–240.

¹⁷ Raghava Iyengar has discussed enough about the linking of the Tamil literary references and the kings with Ramayana and Mahabharata, but, the chronology and dating have to be made acceptable.



Teaching purpose



To keep a record of something



Non-literary subjects can be taught only with written books.

Classification of Indian Languages: Indian Logical Agreement System in Languages, has to be then, identified for study. As the Indian languages have been broadly classified into following categories:

1. Indo-European Family (Arya),
2. Dravidian Family (Dravida),
3. Austric Family (Nishada), and
4. Sino Tibetan Family (Kirata).

They have been in turn divided into subgroups to many amounting to hundred. Since the mid-19th century it has been recognised that most of the 462 languages of India belong to two main stocks: the Dravidian family and the Indo-European family. More than a billion people live in India. Of these, about 20% speak a Dravidian language, such as Telugu, Malayalam, Tamil and Kannada. Meanwhile, 75% speak an Indo-European one, including Hindi, Punjabi and Urdu. And definitely, there has been connection between these two language speaking people, as they have been getting along for the last 5000 YBP. In other words, there was no linguistic, language or speaking problem among Indians in acting, interacting and counteracting.

“Language-with-script people” and “language without script people”:

Much fuss has been made about the ‘people with script’ and ‘people without script’, as if the latter are inferior to former. But, the issue has to be studied critically.



Why a people should or should not have a script? As explained above, a group of people after language formation, they need not have a script, in fact, there is no necessity for a script there.



Then, why a script is required? Naturally, when anybody or any group of people does not understand the language of another group of people, then, script is required.



So when the language-knowing people become dominant or want them to make the language not-knowing people to learn their language, then, the necessity of script arises.



Conversely, if the language not-knowing people want to learn the language of others, they have to have a script.

In Indian tradition, the child starts learn from the conception, after birth from mother and from teacher thereafter. As listening makes the way, there is no script either in mathematics or philosophy.

Spoken language and Written language: Language is for communication, however, when it is spoken for the purpose, written form is not considered. However, when, anything has to be recorded, then, written form is necessitated. Of course, it is not necessary, if a man knows one language with script but speaks more than one language without script, with his known script, he can record. Suppose, if he does not want to reveal his ideas or kept them as secret, he might do it in his own language. The western or Greek dictum that “written words are the sign of words spoken” or “writing is mirror of speech” does not hold water. Writing may not prove one’s

superiority over others, rather it may attest his inability or inefficiency to express himself in his language. If a speaker or a particular language-speaking people are capable of expressing anything in speech, then for them, the script is not necessary

Literature without script and script with literature: Archaeologists have now tried to correlate and corroborate the DNA with linguistics and link with the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian language groups¹⁸. “Out of Africa” theory proposes that all Indian language speaking people had common genetic codes so that they could show variance later due to change in hereditary and environmental factors. In other words, the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian language groups could have originated from a single source. In fact, the monogenetic and polygenetic origins of humanity have been there scientifically, linguistically and theologically. In other words, the debate of the origin of language and origin of languages continue even today¹⁹, but, for logical analysis, a consensus has to be made. In this connection, the theories floated by the western experts in the context of India can be studied to understand their logic.

Monogenesis and Polygenesis of language: In the field of linguistics, polygenesis is the view that human languages evolved as several lineages independent of one another. It is contrasted with monogenesis, which is the view that human languages all go back to a single common ancestor. The Proto-Human language (also Proto-Sapiens, Proto-World) is the hypothetical direct genetic predecessor of all the world's spoken languages. It would not be ancestral to sign languages. The concept is speculative and not amenable to analysis in historical linguistics. It presupposes a monogenetic origin of language, i.e. the derivation of all natural languages from a single origin, presumably at some time in the Middle Paleolithic period. As the predecessor of all extant languages spoken by modern humans (*Homo sapiens*), Proto-Human language as hypothesised would not necessarily be ancestral to any hypothetical Neanderthal language.

Indian Logical Agreement System in Languages: Just like “Out of Africa,” theory, an Indigenous origin hypothesis can be evolved and proposed. Indeed, the European Indologists already proposed such hypothesis that origin of human race evolved on the banks of Ganges Valley.

🌐 It was Jean Sylvain Bailly (1744-1844)²⁰, who shifted the origin of human race from Greenland to New Zenyla to Ganges Valley, according to his astronomical calculations. He also explained that arts and sciences were developed only there. Here, actually, the concept of origin of human race located at the Arctic region was changed to Ganges Valley²¹. Voltaire²² also accepted such origins.

¹⁸ Carpelan, Christian, AskoParpola, and Petteri Koskikallio, eds. ***Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations***. Memoires de la Société Finno-Ugrienne, no. 242. Helsinki, Finland: Suomalais-UgrilainenSeura, 2001.

¹⁹ Graffi, Giorgio. “***Origin of language and origin of languages***.” *Evolutionary Linguistic Theory* 1.1 (2019): 6-23.

²⁰ Jean-Sylvail Bailly, ***Traite de V Astronomie Indienne et Orientate***, Paris, 1787, pp. 498-500.

²¹ Bala Gangadhara Tilak, ***The Arctic Home in Vedas***, Poona, 1903.

²² H. Brumfitt (ed.). ***La Philosophie de l'histoire (Studies on Voltaire and Eighteenth Century)***, Vol. XXVIII, Geneva, 1963. Introduction and commentary give valuable details, as mentioned by P.J. Marshall.

- 🌐 Drawing attention to the books of John Zephaniah Holwell and Alexander Dow, he concurred with him that all of their arts, including astronomy, astrology, the concepts of birth and death etc., were derived from the Ganges Valley.
- 🌐 Later Pierre de Sonnerat²³ concluded that it was India that gave the legal system to the humanity and therefore, origin of humanity.
- 🌐 To Guillaume-Thomas-Francois Raynal²⁴, India, not the Middle East, was the earliest inhabited part of the globe and the Indians were 'the first who received the rudiments of science and the polish of civilization'.
- 🌐 Immanuel Kant, Johann Gottfried Herder and others too had such views.

However, they continued to attribute such wisdom, knowledge etc, to a particular group of Indians, Brahmins²⁵, which resulted in anti-Brahmin tendencies later. Moreover, the pro-Hindu support of the European intelligentsia had turned into anti-Hindu, as when the question of faith came into play. To quote, P.J. Marshall, "Joseph Priestley (1733-1804)²⁶, the greatest scientist of the late eighteenth century, came to the defence of Moses, as Newton had done at the beginning of the century." So also Isaac Newton²⁷ and the host of European scientists started turning against India²⁸. Thomas R. Trautmann²⁹ has also pointed out such defences of Moses of Newton and Jacob Bryant.

Longevity of civilization is decided based on subjective or objective evidences?: The literature has to be correlated, corroborated and corresponded with the science and technological development and material evidences. In other words, the literature of science and technology had to be there for antique-claiming people, as the epigenetics, phylogeny and ontogeny are closely connected with them. Generally, Assyrian, Babylonian, Egyptian and other Mediterranean civilization would be given credit for the most of the inventions of science and technology and after their disappearance, to the Greeks. Now, all the subjects, including the recent

²³ Pierre de Sonnerat, *Voyage aux Indes Orientales*, 1782.

²⁴ Guillaume-Thomas-Francois Raynal, *History of the Indies*, Vol. I, pp. 35, 38.

²⁵ Leon Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth: A history of races and nationalist ideas in Europe*, translated by George W. Howard, Chatto, Heinemann for Sussex University Press, London, 1974. See Chapter 9. Quoting Cassini, Bailly, Voltaire, Alexander Dow, Holwell, Edward Tyson, *The Anthropologist* Ashley Montagu, Philadelphia, 1943. Herder, *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Mankind*.

²⁶ Joseph Priestley, *A Comparison of the Institutions of Moses with those of the Hindoos and other Ancient Nations*, Northumberland, 1799. Quoted by P.J. Marshall, *The British Discovery of Hinduism in the Eighteenth Century*, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1970, p. 34.

²⁷ Isaac Newton, *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended*, London, 1728. Also see: Frank E. Manuel, *Isaac Newton, Historian*, Cambridge, 1963. Sir Isaac Newton and Chronology in <http://www.reformation.org/newton.html> and

http://www.geometry.net/scientists/newton_sir_isaac.php. About Newton, there have been interesting websites and e-correspondence, particularly about his manuscripts, which are secretly kept by someone, particularly related to chronology. Some other manuscripts were already reportedly disappeared and destroyed. C.K. Raju has dealt with it elaborately.

²⁸ K.V. Ramakrishna Rao, *'European Scientists: Indian Chronology and Historiography'*, 20th Session of South Indian History Congress held at Tiruvananthapuram from Feb. 25-27, 2002.

Idem, *'The Interest of European Scientists in Indian Chronology and Historiography'*, UGC Seminar on Situating Historical Writings in Post-Independence India (Abstracts volume), held at Bharathidasan University on March 23 & 23, 2002, Tiruchirappalli, pp. 16-17.

Idem, for complete details of the paper, see *'The Interest of European Scientists in Indian Calendar and Chronology'* (Seminar papers) held at Central Mining Research Institute, Dhanbad on August 9 & 10, 2003, pp. 1-20.

²⁹ Thomas R. Trautmann, *Aryans and British India*, New Delhi: Yoda Press, 2004, pp. 40-41.

ones, take words, expressions and vocabulary from the Greek and thus, students get an impression, as if all subjects started and developed by the Greeks. However, as pointed out and known, only China and India have been having living civilizations. Had those civilizations were having all science and technologies, superiority, virtues etc., why they disappeared, what happened to their languages etc., is not known. In other words, scientifically, whether any correlative study can be made connecting longevity of a civilization with the factors of culture, tradition and heritage with the factors of script, language and literature.

Script, language and literature: That the date of Indian literature has been fixed c.1500-1200 BCE, but the introduction of the script in India is dated to c.300 BCE shows that Indians were illiterate for about 1200-900 years, yet, they were managing to record the whole compendium in their brains. Michael Witzel claims that, “*Indeed, written Vedic texts appear only after c. 1000 CE (note Albiruni’s testimony about Vasukra in Kashmir, and the earliest Veda MSS in Nepal)*”, as the “Brahmins” never wanted Vedas to be written down³⁰. In other words, it is not known who were preventing writing Vedas till c.1000 CE and getting written thereafter. Again how Vedas were preserved from c.300 BCE to c.1000 CE is also not known. That the Indians could keep memorizing Vedas till c.300 BCE is intriguing. Therefore, it is clear that the idea that the composers of Vedas were illiterate i.e, without script is totally wrong, as they had language and literature. In the same way, if somebody says that it was written down only in c.200 BCE, but verses were went on added till medieval period, until a critical edition was prepared in 20th century, it is also intriguing, because, the capacity of the people to remember millions and thousands of verses is more stimulating. The mnemonic power of the nomads, oppressors, suppressors, illiterates etc., has been fantastic indeed.

How a model for “Indian Logical Agreement System in languages” can be created?: As the Gudiyam men were living millions of years ago, the Pallavaram axe-man was there around 45,000 YBP and the Pallavas could produce rock-cut “Pancha Pandava temple” just opposite on the eastern side of Pallavaram on a hillock, it is reasonable that the evolutionary development of man could be assessed in an around Madras, but, historical antiquity goes to Keeladi now. Unfortunately, here, no inscriptions were found matching with such antiquity. In other words, archaeological evidences found at different places dated to various periods of the same people may not be correlated, corroborated and corresponded with the literature or vice versa. So here also, researchers have to have Logical Agreement System. Thus, in Indian context of the past, certain type of “Indic language system” could be imagined, so that the chronological study can be matched with the logical system. In other words, the above 75% and 25% language speaking people groups should be brought under such “Indian Logical Agreement System in languages.”

✍ Now, all languages have been converted into machine languages and thus can be typed, checked, edited, translated and understood by all.

✍ Now, Google provides translation of all Indian languages (from one language to another).

³⁰ Michael Witzel, ***Gandhāra and the formation of the Vedic and Zoroastrian canons***, in proceedings of the international symposium, the book, Romania. Etudes euro- et afro- asiatiques, pp.490-532, Bucharest: Biblioteca Bucuretilor.

- ✍ As these have been carried on men, all the other men could too come to consensus and come together for evolving such “Logical Agreement System.”
- ✍ Most of the factors of culture, tradition, heritage and civilization can be brought together for such agreement for the computational purposes.
- ✍ Such agreements have been done in the machine translation logically.
- ✍ If the politicians, ideologists and theoreticians are not involved, the technical experts can easily carry out to evolve such system.

Conclusion: In view of the above discussion on script, language and literature associating with mind, memory and remembrance with scientific principles, and discussion, the following points are presented as logical conclusion:

- 💻 For more than 5000 / 7000 YBP, Indians had been living together in many parts of India spreading to distant areas touching Central Asia, Arabian Peninsula and Africa.
- 💻 India and China have been the only two living and continuously existing civilizations with contacts.
- 💻 So also the Egyptian (Nile), Mesopotamian (Euphrates and Tigris), Harappan (Indus and its tributaries) and Chinese (Huang Ho) civilizations situated 1200, 2500 and 3200 kms respectively were existing with contacts.
- 💻 Therefore, scientifically, it cannot be concluded that one group of people were illiterate, whereas the others were literate; barbaric and civilized; prehistoric and historic and so on.
- 💻 India with vast area and largest population is bound to have differences and thus, many languages were spoken 2000-3000 YBP and now also.
- 💻 The Individual groups continue to exist since thousands of years, as they had to depend upon each other in many aspects.
- 💻 Indians had / have been travelling in all directions for social, religious, economic, commercial and political purposes.
- 💻 Thus, such interactions, counteractions would continue forever with all variance and is conceived, perceived, evolved and proposed only under such circumstances in the 21st century with all computational expertise.
- 💻 As such computational expertise is available, agreement has to be reached logically in diversities.
- 💻 Logical Agreement brings all languages together.
- 💻 All languages can be united with matching factors of culture, tradition, heritage and civilization, removing and correcting the mismatches.
- 💻 Then, such evolved system could be the expected Indian Logical Agreement System in Languages.